

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332)  
United States Attorney

2 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163173)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
6 San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5056  
7 FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION  
12

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 BLANCA GOMEZ,

17 Defendant.  
18

No. CR 09-00152 HRL

STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~  
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

19 On April 16, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference.  
20 At the appearance, U.S. Attorney Law Clerk Christopher Judge and Assistant Federal Public  
21 Defender Lara Vinnard requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from April 16,  
22 2009 to May 12, 2009. The basis for the exclusion is to afford AFPD Vinnard additional time to  
23 review and discuss the proposed plea agreement with the defendant. The undersigned parties  
24 agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for  
25 effective preparation of counsel.

26 //

27 //

28 //

SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO  
United States Attorney

DATED: 4/20/09

/s/  
SUSAN KNIGHT  
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: 4/20/09

/s/  
LARA VINNARD  
Assistant Federal Public Defender

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from April 16, 2009 to May 12, 2009. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary to prepare her defense and deny her an effective evaluation of the government's proposal, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: 4/21/09

  
HOWARD L. LLOYD  
United States Magistrate Judge